



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,059	01/20/2005	Jun Shinozaki	MAT-8640US	1894
23122	7590	03/19/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			DHINGRA, RAKESH KUMAR	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,059

Applicant(s)

SHINOZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

RAKESH K. DHINGRA

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/9/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 by adding new limitations {for example in claim 1 new limitations "a first", and "below", and "a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame" have been added. In addition applicant has added new claims 7 and 8.

Accordingly claims 1-8 are now pending and active.

New reference by Ida et al (US 6,509,061) when combined with Homme et al and Tanaka reads on amended claims 1, 4 limitations. Accordingly claims 1, 4 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as explained below. Balance claims 2, 3 and 5-7 have also been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as explained below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have

been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(c), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al (US Patent No. 6,919,569) in view of Tanaka et al (US PGPUB No. 203/0200928) and Ida et al (US 6,509,061).

Regarding Claims 1, 4, 8: Homme et al teach a method for deposition comprising the steps of providing:

A substrate holder 200 (first frame) for holding a substrate 1 of a display panel, said first frame 200 holding the substrate 1 has a protrusion 200a extending from the bottom surface of the substrate along a side surface of the substrate to a height greater than a height of the substrate without being superimposed over the top surface of the substrate, and providing a display panel that is held by the substrate holder for deposition (e.g. Fig. 7 and col. 4, lines 16-50).

Homme et al do not teach a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame.

Tanaka et al teach an apparatus for deposition of displays (Figure 11) comprising a frame 14 with multiple adjacent openings (like plurality of frames) for processing displays. Tanaka et al further

teach that in each frame openings an individual substrate can be disposed for processing (para. 0016, 0020-0038).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide substrate holder with first and second frames as taught by Tanaka et al in the apparatus of Homme et al to enable process plurality of substrates simultaneously.

Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al do not teach second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame.

Ida et al teach a deposition apparatus comprising a chamber 43 with deposition sources 44, 46 for deposition on a substrate 60. Ida et al further teach that openings 61, 63 are provided adjacent substrate 60 (to avoid any deposition in case the opening was covered), and thus avoid uniformity defect in deposition (e.g. Fig. 5A, 5B and col. 5, lines 35-45). It would be obvious to provide an opening in the frame adjacent the substrate (similar to a second frame without a substrate) as taught by Ida et al in the apparatus of Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al to avoid uniformity defect on the substrate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to provide a second frame having an opening and disposed adjacent the first frame as taught by Ida et al in the apparatus of Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al to avoid uniformity defect on the substrate.

Further, claim limitation reciting a substrate of the plasma display panel as substrate is an intended use limitation and since the prior art apparatus meets the structural limitations of the claim, the same is considered capable of meeting the intended use limitations.

Claims 2, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al (US Patent No. 6,919,569) in view of Tanaka et al (US PG PUB No. 203/0200928) and Ida et al (US 6,509,061) as applied to claims 1, 4, 8 and further in view of Patadia et al (US Patent No. 6,146,504).

Regarding Claims 2, 5: Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al teach all limitations of the claim except height of protrusion.

Patadia et al teach a deposition apparatus and method comprising a substrate support 110 for supporting a substrate and a dam 132 (protrusion) is provided around the perimeter of the substrate receiving surface of support to minimize backside deposition on the substrate. Patadia et al further teach that position and dimensions of the dam 132 (protrusion) are optimized (as a result effective variable) to prevent the reaction material reaching backside of substrate (e.g. Fig. 1, 9 and col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 65). It would be obvious to optimize the height of protrusion (as a result effective variable) as taught by Patadia et al, as per process limitations like type of gases, gas flow rate and gas pressure.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the height of protrusion as taught by Patadia et al in the apparatus and method of Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al to minimize backside deposition on the substrate.

In this connection courts have ruled:

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum value of a cause effective variable through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 3, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al (US Patent No. 6,919,569) in view of Tanaka et al (US PG PUB No. 203/0200928) and Ida et al (US 6,509,061) as applied to Claims 1, 4, 8 and further in view of Hiroki et al (US Patent No. 5,374,147).

Regarding Claims 3, 6: Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al teach all limitations of the claim including substrate holder (frame) 1 for holding substrate, but do not teach holding means including supporting means and positioning means.

Hiroki et al teach an apparatus and method for supporting a substrate 2 by a frame 73 and where the frame comprises support means 88 and positioning means (83, 84 with stoppers 85, 86) for positioning the substrate 2 in a planar direction, wherein the substrate is held by fitting the substrate to the positioning means (83-86) and placing the substrate on the support means 88 (e.g. Fig. 12 and col. 10, lines 13-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use frame with support means and positioning means as taught by Hiroki et al in the apparatus and method of Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al to ensure correct positioning of the substrate.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al (US Patent No. 6,919,569) in view of Tanaka et al (US PG PUB No. 203/0200928) and Ida et al (US 6,509,061) as applied to Claims 1, 4, 8 and further in view of Won et al (US 6,355,108).

Regarding Claim 7: Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al teach all limitations of the claim including first frame 1 for holding substrate, but do not teach first frame includes a plurality of tabs separated from each other which extend below the bottom surface of the substrate.

Won et al teach a deposition apparatus and method comprising a frame 22 with plurality of tabs 26. Won et al also teach that the tabs 26 support the substrate 28 on the deposition face and are shaped to accommodate the substrate 28, and comprise protruding contact surfaces for stabilizing a substrate on a support member during processing (e.g. Fig. 3, 4 and col. 5, line 25 to col. 6, line 35) [since applicant's specification does not explicitly describe any "tab", examiner has interpreted that the plurality of tabs as claimed refer to "Support 6a" in Fig. 6 – applicant is invited to confirm this]. Further, though, Won et al do not explicitly teach the tabs extend below the bottom surface of the substrate (during processing), the tabs 26 as taught by Won et al would obviously extend below the substrate in case frame 22 was used upside down with a deposition source disposed below the substrate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the first frame with a plurality of tabs as taught by Won et al in the apparatus and method of Homme et al in view of Tanaka et al and Ida et al to stabilize the substrate on the frame during processing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAKESH K. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)272-5959. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 -6:00 (Monday - Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571)-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rakesh K Dhingra/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Karla Moore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792